

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 15 and 19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 are amended and claims 24 and 25 are canceled. Favorable reconsideration of the application and allowance of all of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 14, 19, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,052,786 to Tsuchida (hereinafter "Tsuchida").

Independent claims 1 and 14 are amended herein to include some of the subject matter of claims 24 and 25, but also worded so as to clarify the distinctions of the present invention over Tsuchida. In particular, these claims recite first and second door logic that are controlled to pass a valid header between each other and in so doing bypassing an encryption process/component. The claims further state that the second door logic is responsive to a signaling indicative of a valid header so as to open without waiting for the encrypted data to be matched with the header and that the first door logic and the second door logic operate independently of each other such that if the first door logic malfunctions, the second door logic stays closed.

Support for these claim amendments is found at paragraphs [0031] and [0032] in the specification of the present application.

The Office Action concedes that Tsuchida does not explicitly disclose signaling to signify validation prior to a merge operation of the unencrypted header and the encrypted data. In fact, Tsuchida does not disclose validating the header by examining the header for format, number and bits and contents based on a security policy that defines what in the header is to be examined. Tsuchida also does not disclose: first door logic and second door logic that are connected to each other, wherein (a) the second door logic is responsive to the signaling of a valid header in order to open without waiting for the encrypted data to be matched with the header, and (b) the first door logic and the second door logic are operated independently of each other such that if the first door logic malfunctions, the second door logic stays open. The point

of these concepts that are recited in claims 1 and 14, but are not taught or suggested anywhere in Tsuchida, is to emphasize that it is **not necessary** that bypassing the header around the encryption component be precisely synchronized with the passing of the data through the encryption component. This is in contrast to the contention at page 3 of the Office Action, last paragraph, that even though Tsuchida does not explicitly disclose the signaling concept recited in the claims, that it would be common sense to provide signals to the door logic components in order to maintain synchronization.

Tsuchida makes no teaching or suggestion of validating a command represented by a header in accordance with rules of a security policy, and Tsuchida makes no teaching or suggestion of providing first and second door logic components that are operated independently of each other such that if the first door logic malfunctions, the second door logic stays closed, but that the second door logic can open and receive a valid header without waiting for the encrypted data to be matched with the header.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims 1 and 14 are non-obvious over and above Tsuchida. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to find the application to be in condition for allowance with claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 15 and 19. However, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees required for the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 05-0460.

Dated: June 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted by:

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER NO. 27896
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640

/D. Andrew Floam/

D. Andrew Floam
Reg. No. 34597